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## INTRODUCTION

The Intermediate Mathematics Placement Test (MPT-I) has been used for many years to place students into entry-level math courses at Washington state public baccalaureate institutions. The MPT-I was developed to assess student readiness for the traditional precalculus-calculus sequence; however, the focus in post-secondary math education has recently expanded to include a broader range of entry-level math courses as reflected in the recent Washington state College Readiness Mathematics Standards (CRMS). In 2007, Washington state legislators mandated that the Mathematics Placement Test (MPT) be revised to serve as a common college readiness test for all two and four-year institutions of higher education in Washington state, and that all institutions use a common performance standard on the test for purposes of determining college readiness in mathematics. ${ }^{1}$

For the past two years, math faculty from four-year, two-year, and K-12 schools have worked together to create the new General Mathematics Placement Test (MPT-G). ${ }^{2}$ The MPT-G has been developed to place students into a wide array of entry-level math courses, and to provide the basis for computing a single consistent index of students' readiness for college-level mathematics. ${ }^{3}$ This report describes the results of a pilot study conducted to inform discussions among faculty as they set a specific cut score on the MPT-G to serve as the criterion for college readiness. Two research questions of particular interest were: 1) How does student performance on the new MPT-G compare with their performance on the MPT-I? 2) How well do student test scores predict subsequent course grades?

## METHOD

The pilot study was conducted between October 2008 and June 2009. The MPT-G and MPT-I were administered to groups of high school and post-secondary students, and subsequent course grades were provided by participating institutions. Student participation was solicited through representatives of four-year, two-year, and K-12 schools and tests were administered in one of two modes (testing center vs. testing site).

## Testing Centers

Institutions that participate in the Academic Placement Testing Program (APTP) administer Math Placement Tests on a regular basis as part of ongoing enrollment and registration. Tests are administered in campus testing centers and the results are used to place students into mathematics courses. For purposes of the pilot, four four-year institutions agreed to administer

[^0]the MPT-G and MPT-I alternately to students who would otherwise take the MPT-I during autumn through spring academic terms. Tests were administered under controlled conditions as specified in the APTP Testing Center Manual. As shown in Table 1, tests were completed by 1215 students in this mode. Test results were used to determine actual course placements for students.

Table 1. Number of completed tests and grades by institution and test type.

| Type of Institution | Mode* | Completed Tests |  |  | Completed Tests and Grades |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | MPT-G | MPT-I | Total | MPT-G | MPT-I | Total |
| Total |  | 1681 | 2014 | 3695 | 1024 | 1337 | 2361 |
| Four-Year Institutions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Eastern Washington University | TC | 344 | 302 | 646 | 93 | 90 | 183 |
| University of Washington | TC | 76 | 158 | 234 | 29 | 80 | 109 |
| Washington State University | TC | 54 | 125 | 179 | 17 | 54 | 71 |
| Western Washington University | TC | 67 | 89 | 156 | 35 | 60 | 95 |
| Subtotal |  | 541 | 674 | 1215 | 174 | 284 | 458 |
| Evergreen State College | TS | 16 | 18 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Subtotal |  | 557 | 692 | 1249 | 174 | 284 | 458 |
| Two-Year Institutions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Edmonds Community College | TS | 46 | 43 | 89 | 41 | 39 | 80 |
| Spokane Falls Community College | TS | 67 | 70 | 137 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Subtotal |  | 113 | 113 | 226 | 41 | 39 | 80 |
| High Schools |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Anacortes High School | TS | 83 | 87 | 170 | 82 | 86 | 168 |
| Bellingham High School | TS | 59 | 69 | 128 | 59 | 68 | 128 |
| Blaine High School | TS | 70 | 71 | 141 |  |  | 0 |
| Eastside Catholic High School | TS | 15 | 14 | 29 | 15 | 14 | 29 |
| Evergreen High School | TS | 11 | 19 | 30 | 6 | 11 | 22 |
| Ferndale High School | TS | 77 | 69 | 146 | 77 | 68 | 145 |
| Heritage High School | TS | 28 | 28 | 56 | 26 | 27 | 53 |
| Lynden Christian High School | TS | 34 | 41 | 75 | 34 | 41 | 75 |
| Mountain View High School | TS | 87 | 148 | 235 | 65 | 114 | 180 |
| Mt. Baker High School | TS | 7 | 8 | 15 | 7 | 8 | 15 |
| Naches Valley High School | TS | 8 | 6 | 14 | 8 | 6 | 14 |
| Nooksack Valley High School | TS | 35 | 52 | 87 | 34 | 50 | 87 |
| North Central High School | TS | 69 | 94 | 163 | 39 | 92 | 131 |
| Prairie High School | TS | 50 | 45 | 95 |  |  | 0 |
| Prosser High School | TS | 19 | 17 | 36 | 19 | 17 | 36 |
| Shadle Park High School | TS | 128 | 122 | 250 | 121 | 116 | 237 |
| Shoreline School District | TS | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| Sumner School District | TS | 50 | 71 | 121 | 45 | 71 | 118 |
| Union High School | TS | 64 | 136 | 200 | 51 | 111 | 162 |
| Wapato High School | TS | 13 | 13 | 26 | 13 | 13 | 26 |
| West Valley High School | TS | 102 | 98 | 200 | 101 | 96 | 197 |
| Subtotal |  | 1011 | 1209 | 2220 | 804 | 1010 | 1814 |

* TC=Testing Center; TS=Testing Site


## Testing Sites

To provide test data for students from other educational sectors, representatives from Evergreen State College, community and technical colleges, and high schools administered the MPT-G and MPT-I to groups of students during winter and spring 2009. Students were given either the MPT-G or MPT-I (assigned alternately) and were able to use their test results for placement at four-year institutions. Some administrations were conducted in auditoria, some in
testing centers, and others in the classroom. Tests were administered under controlled conditions as specified in an administration manual modeled on the APTP Testing Site Manual. As shown in the Table, 34 four-year students, 229 two-year students, and 2220 high school students participated in this mode.

Table 1 also shows the number of students for whom both test and grade data were available. Four-year institutions (with the exception of the Evergreen State College) submitted student grades in the first math course in which they enrolled subsequent to testing. All other institutions submitted grades for courses in which students were currently enrolled. We particularly requested participation of students who were just completing Algebra II/Trigonometry or Integrated Math 3, or who were entering Precalculus or other college level mathematics courses, as these courses would be most useful in helping to define college readiness. However, other student groups were included as requested by specific institutions.

For the purpose of analysis, all letter grades were converted to numeric values according to the scheme given in Table 2. Grades that did not count toward a student's GPA (e.g., Withdrew or Satisfactory) were treated as missing. As shown in the table, numeric grades were available for $64 \%$ of all test-takers.

Table 2. Letter-to-number grade conversion table.

| Letter grade | A | A- | B+ | B | B- | C+ | C | C- | D+ | D | D- | F |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Numeric equivalent | 4.0 | 3.7 | 3.3 | 3.0 | 2.7 | 2.3 | 2.0 | 1.7 | 1.3 | 1.0 | .7 | 0 |

## RESULTS

## Test Reliability

Both the MPT-G and MPT-I showed high internal consistency ( $\alpha=.84$ and .85 , respectively).

## Test Difficulty

Students found the MPT-G to be more difficult than the MPT-I ( $M n=18.4$ and 20.4, respectively, as shown in Table 3). This difference was statistically significant, $F(1,3689)=33.6, p<10^{-8}$. Both tests were fairly difficult; given the total possible score of 35 on each test, the percentage equivalents for the respective means were $52.6 \%$ and $58.3 \%$.

Table 3. Average total score by administration mode and type of institution.

|  | MPT-G |  |  | MPT-I |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Mode / Institution | Mean | SD | n | Mean | SD | $\boldsymbol{n}$ |
| Overall | 18.4 | 6.5 | 1681 | 20.4 | 6.4 | 2014 |
| Four-Year Institutions | 18.2 | 6.2 | 557 | 21.0 | 6.1 | 692 |
| Two-Year Institutions | 18.8 | 6.2 | 113 | 20.1 | 6.4 | 113 |
| High Schools | 18.5 | 6.7 | 1011 | 20.1 | 6.5 | 1209 |

Although we attempted to match the overall difficulty of the new MPT-G and revised, threeoption MPT-I ${ }^{4}$ to the original five-option MPT-I, we were successful only with respect to the MPT-G. The average MPT-G total score was the same as that observed for the original MPT-I during the 2007-2008 APTP testing year $(M n=18.4)$.

Table 3 also shows the average test scores by type of institution. In addition to the statistically significant main effect for test type, we found a significant interaction between test type and type of institution, $F(1,3689)=3.5, p=.03$. The difference in student performance on the MPT-G and MPT-I was less pronounced among students from high schools and two-year institutions than among four-year students. In particular, there was no significant difference in performance on the two tests among students from two-year schools (Figure 1); however, it is difficult to know how generalizable this result is given the extremely small number of students from this sector. It is possible that differences across institution type were somehow related to differences in student incentive: students at four-year institutions took the tests as part of the normal course registration process, whereas students at high schools and two-year institutions did not have this same motivation.


Figure 1. Average total score by test type and institution type.

## Test Scores and Grades

Tables 4-6 show the average MPT total score by course type and level, and correlations between MPT total score and course grade within each of the three sectors. For the purpose of these analyses, high school statistics, precalculus, and calculus courses were identified as "college level" courses. Although total test scores of high school, two-year, and four-year students were not significantly different from one another $(F(2,3689)=.7)$, total test scores of students in college level courses were significantly higher than those not in college level courses. A six point difference was observed for both the MPT-G (Mns 22.1 and 16.1), $F(1,2443)=274, p<10^{-57}$, and the MPT-I (Mns 23.7 and 17.7), $F(1,2443)=360, p<10^{-74}$ (see Figure 2). Importantly, these main effects were not qualified by an interaction with type of institution; that is, the magnitude of the effect of course level on test score was similar in high schools and four-year schools.

[^1]Table 4. Correlations between total score and course grade among high school students.

| Type and Level of Course | MPT-G |  |  |  | MPT-I |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mean | SD | $r$ | n | Mean | SD | $r$ | n |
| Overall | 18.6 | 6.8 | . $41 \dagger$ | 804 | 20.2 | 6.5 | . $42 \dagger$ | 1010 |
| Below Algebra II | 13.4 | 4.8 | -. 23 | 10 | 13.3 | 3.5 | . 40 | 19 |
| Integrated 2 | 13.3 | 4.9 | .31* | 45 | 17.3 | 5.6 | .41 $\dagger$ | 70 |
| Integrated 3 | 15.2 | 5.2 | . $37 \dagger$ | 183 | 17.8 | 5.3 | . $24 \dagger$ | 264 |
| Algebra Il+ | 18.5 | 6.1 | .49 $\dagger$ | 234 | 18.9 | 5.5 | . $38 \dagger$ | 237 |
| College Transition | 14.5 | 4.9 | . 19 | 24 | 14.8 | 4.7 | .61* | 17 |
| Statistics | 21.7 | 6.2 | -- | 7 | 23.8 | 5.8 | . 52 * | 36 |
| Precalculus | 27.0 | 4.9 | . $40 \dagger$ | 223 | 28.1 | 5.8 | . $50 \dagger$ | 276 |
| Calculus | 18.3 | 9.7 | . $52 \dagger$ | 51 | 19.0 | 6.3 | . $55 \dagger$ | 65 |
| Other | 14.8 | 5.8 | . 11 | 27 | 17.7 | 4.9 | -. 12 | 26 |
| Below college level | 16.4 | 5.9 | .41 $\dagger$ | 523 | 17.9 | 5.4 | .31 $\dagger$ | 633 |
| College level | 22.6 | 6.4 | . $44 \dagger$ | 281 | 24.1 | 6.3 | . $52 \dagger$ | 377 |

Note. * $p<.05,{ }^{\dagger} p<.001$
Table 5. Correlations between total score and course grade among students at two-year institutions.

|  | MPT-G |  |  |  | MPT-I |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Type and Level of Course | Mean | SD | $r$ | n | Mean | SD | $r$ | n |
| Overall | 20.2 | 5.9 | . 26 | 41 | 20.8 | 6.5 | .33* | 39 |
| Below Algebra II |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Integrated 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Integrated 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Algebra II+ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| College Transition |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Statistics |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Precalculus | 20.3 | 6.0 | . 27 | 40 | 20.9 | 6.5 | .35* | 38 |
| Calculus |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other |  |  | -- | 1 |  |  | -- | 1 |
| Below college level |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |
| College level | 20.3 | 6.0 | . 27 | 40 | 20.9 | 6.5 | . 35 | 38 |

Note. * $p<.05,{ }^{\dagger} p<.001$
Table 6. Correlations between total score and course grade among students at four-year institutions.

| Type and Level of Course | MPT-G |  |  |  | MPT-I |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mean | SD | $r$ | n | Mean | SD | $r$ | n |
| Overall | 18.9 | 6.3 | . $42 \dagger$ | 174 | 21.6 | 6.3 | . $39 \dagger$ | 284 |
| Below Algebra II | 9.8 | 3.8 | . 37 | 19 | 10.0 | 4.9 | -. 01 | 11 |
| College Transition |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Integrated 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Integrated 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Algebra II+ | 13.5 | 2.6 | . 03 | 27 | 14.6 | 3.9 | . 27 | 38 |
| Statistics |  |  | -- | 4 |  |  | -- | 8 |
| Precalculus | 24.0 | 3.8 | . 32 | 33 | 25.1 | 4.6 | . 12 | 71 |
| Calculus | -- | -- | -- | 3 | -- | -- | -- | 2 |
| Other | 20.5 | 5.1 | .31* | 88 | 22.4 | 5.1 | . $42 \dagger$ | 154 |
| Below college level | 12.4 | 3.8 | . 20 | 50 | 14.6 | 5.1 | .33* | 60 |
| College level | 21.6 | 5.0 | .31* | 124 | 23.5 | 5.1 | . $30 \dagger$ | 224 |

Note. ${ }^{*} p<.05,^{\dagger} p<.001$


Figure 2. Average total score by test type and course level.

Figure 3 shows mean MPT-G and MPT-I scores by type of course, for all institution types. Students enrolled in higher level math courses tended to receive higher test scores, providing confirmatory evidence of the validity of the tests. For example, the traditional Algebra II-Precalculus-Calculus sequence shows steadily increasing mean scores, with a consistent onepoint difference between performance on the MPT-G and MPT-I. Larger differences (three- to four-points) were observed for Integrated 2 and 3 courses, and for the heterogeneous Other category.


Figure 3. Average total score by test type and course.

As shown in Tables 4 and 6, MPT scores were moderately (and statistically significantly) correlated with math course grades within both high schools and four-year schools. In each instance, total test score correlated about $r=.4$ with course grade. Within high schools correlations were also significant at the level of specific types of courses (e.g., Integrated 3, Calculus, etc.). At four-year schools the course-type-level correlations were attenuated because MPT scores had been used for placement into those math courses. Nevertheless, both MPT-G and MPT-I total scores did predict college level and non-college level grades as a group.

Although zero order correlation coefficients provided clear evidence of the relationship between test scores and course grades within the high schools, performance in college level courses is more directly related to discussions of college readiness. For this reason, we carried out additional analyses focusing specifically on data provided by the four-year schools in which students were placed into courses by their test scores (i.e., EWU, UW, WSU, and WWU).

As shown in Table 7, the majority of students at four-year schools completed those courses with a numeric grade of 2.0 or better. Specifically, $70.6 \%$ of those in the MPT-G group were subsequently "successful," as were $69.0 \%$ of the MPT-I group. Additionally, students who achieved a course grade of at least 2.0 tended to have scored significantly higher on the MPT than those who did not, $F(1,450)=13.8, p=.0002$. This difference was observed on both the MPT-G (Mns = 15.8 vs. 20.4) and MPT-I (Mns = 18.4 vs. 23.1).

Table 7. Average total score by course grade and level of course (four-year schools).

| Level of Course and Course Grade | Mean | MPT-G |  | Mean | MPT-I |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | SD | n |  | SD | n |
| Overall |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Below 2.0 | 15.8 | 5.9 | 54 | 18.4 | 5.9 | 88 |
| 2.0 or Greater | 20.4 | 6.0 | 120 | 23.1 | 5.9 | 196 |
| Below college level |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Below 2.0 | 11.7 | 3.9 | 27 | 13.8 | 4.2 | 33 |
| 2.0 or Greater | 13.2 | 3.6 | 23 | 15.6 | 6.0 | 27 |
| College level, General |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Below 2.0 | 18.1 | 2.7 | 18 | 19.4 | 4.7 | 36 |
| 2.0 or Greater | 21.3 | 5.4 | 70 | 23.7 | 4.8 | 115 |
| College level, Precalculus+ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Below 2.0 | 23.7 | 5.1 | 9 | 24.5 | 3.5 | 19 |
| 2.0 or Greater | 24.1 | 3.4 | 27 | 25.5 | 5.0 | 54 |

Logistic regression analyses indicated that the two tests were equally successful at predicting course success within four-year schools. As shown in Table 8, both the MPT-G and MPT-I total test scores were significant predictors of course success. Furthermore, a Wald chi-square test for a difference between the logit coefficients by test type was not significantly different from zero, $\chi^{2}(1)=.03, p=.86$. In other words, MPT-G and MPT-I total test scores were equally effective in predicting course success. This analysis was repeated for college-level courses only and for $E W U^{5}$ separately from the other three schools: in neither instance did the logit coefficients differ by test type.

Table 8. Logistic regression coefficients by test type (four-year schools).

| Test Type and Predictor | Logit (B) | SE(B) | Odds Ratio <br> $($ Exp(B)) |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| General |  |  |  |
| $\quad$ Constant | -1.58 | .57 | .20 |
| $\quad$ Total Test Score | .13 | .03 | 1.14 |
| Intermediate |  |  |  |
| $\quad$ Constant | -1.81 | .48 | .16 |
| $\quad$ Total Test Score | .12 | .02 | 1.13 |

[^2]To provide more specific information for setting a college readiness cut score, the observed rates of course success (i.e., grade equal to or greater than 2.0) in non-precalculus/calculus collegelevel courses are shown in Figure 4 as a function of MPT total score. The MPT-I line conforms to the shape of an ideal trend line (i.e., monotonically increasing), but the line for the MPT-G does not. However, the errors bars in the graph indicate that the observed proportions for the two tests at each score point were not significantly different.


Figure 4. Observed rates of success in non-precalculus/calculus college level courses as a function of total test score (4-year schools).

Table 9 shows the observed rates of success for test scores similar to those currently in use at four-year schools as placement cut scores. The cut score for the MPT-I is shown as two points higher than that for the MPT-G to reflect the difference in test difficulty.

Table 9. Observed rates of success for selected MPT-G and MPT-I cut scores.

| MPT-G | $15+$ | $16+$ | $17+$ | $18+$ | $19+$ | $20+$ | $21+$ |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| cut score | .79 | .78 | .82 | .87 | .91 | .91 | .89 |
| MPT-I | $17+$ | $18+$ | $19+$ | $20+$ | $21+$ | $22+$ | $23+$ |
| cut Score | .80 | .83 | .85 | .86 | .86 | .87 | .87 |

## SUMMARY POINTS

- Total test scores were statistically reliable for both MPT-G and MPT-I.
- The MPT-G and MPT-I were both fairly difficult ( $52.6 \%$ and $58.3 \%$ total correct, respectively).
- The MPT-G was more difficult than MPT-I by approximately two points. This difference was largely due to the performance of students enrolled in integrated math courses who showed a much greater difference in performance on the two tests than did students taking other courses.
- Discriminant validity was demonstrated for both tests by the superior performance of students taking college level math courses over those in pre-college level courses.
- Predictive validity was demonstrated for both tests by the significant correlations between total test scores and mathematics course grades. Though modest, significant effects were obtained even at four-year schools where the test scores had been used for placement.
- It was striking that, overall, students at four-year universities did not score significantly better than students at high schools. Moreover, whereas high school students in collegelevel courses obtained mean scores that were indistinguishable from those of collegelevel university students, high school students in pre-college courses actually outperformed the complementary university group. One interpretation is that the highest performing math students tend to retain their math skills from high school until the time they sit for the MPT.


## APPENDIX. COURSE NAMES, CATEGORIES, AND LEVELS

| Sector | Course Name | Category | College Level |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Algebra II w Trig | Algebra II+ | no |
| 1 | Algebra II | Algebra II+ | no |
| 1 | Algebraic Functions w/ Trig | Algebra II+ | no |
| 1 | College Algebra w/ Trig | Algebra II+ | no |
| 1 | PRE-AP ALG TRIG | Algebra II+ | no |
| 1 | ALGEBRA 2B | Algebra II+ | no |
| 1 | Advanced Algebra | Algebra II+ | no |
| 1 | Algebra II | Algebra II+ | no |
| 1 | Algebra II | Algebra II+ | no |
| 1 | AdvAlg/ Integrated 3B | Algebra II+ | no |
| 1 | Algebra II | Algebra II+ | no |
| 2 | Intermediate Algebra | Algebra II+ | no |
| 3 | Intermediate Algebra | Algebra II+ | no |
| 3 | Intermediate Algebra | Algebra II+ | no |
| 3 | Intermediate Algebra | Algebra II+ | no |
| 1 | Algebra I | Below Algebra II | no |
| 1 | Geometry | Below Algebra II | no |
| 3 | Basic Algebra for College Students | Below Algebra II | no |
| 3 | Beginning Algebra (SFCC) | Below Algebra II | no |
| 3 | Introductory Algebra | Below Algebra II | no |
| 1 | AP AB CALC 2 | Calculus | yes |
| 1 | AP CALCULUS 2 | Calculus | yes |
| 1 | AP CALC AB 2 | Calculus | yes |
| 1 | Calculus AB/AP2 | Calculus | yes |
| 1 | Calculus AB/AP2 | Calculus | yes |
| 1 | AP CALC AB 2 | Calculus | yes |
| 3 | Mathematical Analysis for Architects | Calculus | yes |
| 3 | Introduction to Math Analysis | Calculus | yes |
| 3 | Calculus and Analytic Geometry | Calculus | yes |
| 3 | Calculus with Applications to Business and Economics | Calculus | yes |
| 1 | College Readiness Bridge Course | College Prep | no |
| 1 | Transition to College Math 601 | College Prep | no |
| 1 | INT ALG/GEO 1B | Integrated 1 | no |
| 1 | INT ALG/GEOM 1B | Integrated 1 | no |
| 1 | INT ALG/GEO 2B | Integrated 2 | no |
| 1 | ALG/GEO/PRECAL2 | Integrated 2 | no |
| 1 | INT ALG/GEO 2B | Integrated 2 | no |
| 1 | Accelerated Integrated 2 | Integrated 2 | no |
| 1 | Integrated II | Integrated 2 | no |
| 1 | INT AL/GEO 2A/2B | Integrated 2 | no |
| 1 | INT ALG/GEOM 2B | Integrated 2 | no |

# APPENDIX. COURSE NAMES, CATEGORIES, AND LEVELS (CONTINUED) 

| Sector | Course Name | Category | College Level |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | INT ALG/GEO 3B | Integrated 3 | no |
| 1 | INT ALG/GEO 3B | Integrated 3 | no |
| 1 | Integrated 3 | Integrated 3 | no |
| 1 | Integrated 3B | Integrated 3 | no |
| 1 | Integrated III | Integrated 3 | no |
| 1 | Integrated III/60 | Integrated 3 | no |
| 1 | Integrated III-A | Integrated 3 | no |
| 1 | Integrated III-B | Integrated 3 | no |
| 1 | HONORS ALG 2B | Integrated 3 | no |
| 1 | HONORS ALG/TRIG | Integrated 3 | no |
| 1 | INT ALG/GEO 3B | Integrated 3 | no |
| 1 | INT ALG/GEOM 3B | Integrated 3 | no |
| 1 | Integrated 4 | Integrated 4 | yes |
| 1 | Understanding Math | Other | no |
| 1 | Finance | Other | no |
| 1 | APPLIED MATH 1B | Other | no |
| 1 | Math in the Modern World | Other | no |
| 1 | Quant Math/2nd | Other | no |
| 2 | Math in Society | Other | yes |
| 3 | Finite Mathematics | Other | yes |
| 3 | Mathematical Reasoning | Other | yes |
| 3 | Algebra with Applications | Other | yes |
| 3 | Introduction to Elementary Functions | Other | yes |
| 3 | Exploring Mathematics | Other | no |
| 3 | Introduction to Mathematics Analysis for Business and Economics | Other | yes |
| 3 | Math For Elementary School Teachers I | Other | yes |
| 3 | Algebra with Applications to Business and Economics | Other | yes |
| 3 | Functions and Algebraic Methods | Other | yes |
| 3 | Mathematical Reasoning and Its Applications | Other | yes |
| 3 | Quantitative Reasoning | Other | yes |
| 3 | Teaching K-8 Mathematics | Other | yes |
| 3 | Algebra Concepts | Other | yes |
| 1 | Precalculus | Precalculus | yes |
| 1 | Precalculus w Trig | Precalculus | yes |
| 1 | Pre Calculus | Precalculus | yes |
| 1 | PRE CALCULUS B | Precalculus | yes |
| 1 | PRE-CALCULUS 2 | Precalculus | yes |
| 1 | Precalculus | Precalculus | yes |
| 1 | Precalculus I | Precalculus | yes |
| 1 | PRE-CALCULUS 2 | Precalculus | yes |
| 1 | MAT 450 Precalculus Honors | Precalculus | yes |
| 1 | Pre-Calculus 2 | Precalculus | yes |
| 1 | Precalculus 2 | Precalculus | yes |
| 1 | PRE CALC 2 | Precalculus | yes |
| 1 | College in HS Precalulus 402 | Precalculus | yes |

## APPENDIX. COURSE NAMES, CATEGORIES, AND LEVELS (CONTINUED)

| Sector | Course Name | Category | College <br> Level |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| 2 | Business Precalculus | Precalculus | yes |
| 2 | Precalculus | Precalculus | yes |
| 3 | Precalculus I | Precalculus | yes |
| 3 | Precalculus | Precalculus | yes |
| 3 | Precalculus | Precalculus | yes |
| 3 | Accelerated Precalculus | Precalculus | yes |
| 3 | Precalculus | Precalculus | yes |
| 1 | AP Stats | Statistics | yes |
| 1 | Stats | Statistics | yes |
| 1 | AP STATISTICS 2 | Statistics | yes |
| 1 | Stats 2/AP | Statistics | yes |
| 3 | Introduction to Statistical Methods | Statistics | yes |
| 3 | Statistical Thinking | Statistics | yes |
| 3 | Introduction to Statistics | Statistics | yes |
| 1 | Collection Of Evidence MATH S2 | WASL Remedial | no |
| 1 | Collection Of Evidence MATH S2 | WASL Remedial | no |
| 1 | SEGMENTED MATH | WASL Remedial | no |


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Second Substitute House Bill 1906, section 10.
    ${ }^{2}$ This collaboration is described at http://www.washington.edu/oea/services/testing_center/crmt/about_crmt.html.
    ${ }^{3}$ Development of the MPT-G is described at http://www.washington.edu/oea/pdfs/reports/OEAReport0801.pdf.

[^1]:    4 To match the format of the new General Math Placement Test, the existing Intermediate and Advanced tests were converted from five-option multiple-choice items to three-option items based on the results of a pretest conducted during the spring 2008 APTP statewide testing.

[^2]:    ${ }^{5}$ Examiners at EWU recognized the difference in student performance on the MPT-G and MPT-I early in the testing year, and adjusted their placement cut scores accordingly.

